ATTACHMENT C: ON-SITE EVALUATION SCORESHEET -- RETENTION REPORT QUALITY ASSESSMENT SHEET

								RETENTION REPORT EVALUATION MATRIX								
								Selection of Sites for On-site Sampling				Data Collection Methodology				
BACKGROUND ON REPORTS																
Internal EE&T ID#	Report Number	Utility Covered	ONSITE SURVEY	PHONE SURVEY	EE&T Reviewer Initials	EE&T Q.C. Initials	EE&T Report Score	Documented Explanation of Sample Construction	Documented Justification of Sample Selection	Documented Justification of Sample Size	Explanation Sample Population Screening/ Site Rejection	Documentation of Who Performed Data Collection	Documentation of Data Collection Procedures	Examples of Survey Instruments and Forms	Quality of Survey Instruments and Forms, and Data Collected	Documentation of Period of Field Data Collection
						CRITERIA CATEGORY ID		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
						CRITERIA WEIGHTING FACTOR (Total equals 100 points)		15	3	3	7	3	15	5	5	3
						high score	100%	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
						average score	80%	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.3	3.8	2.9	3.5	4.1	2.1
						low score	44%	3	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Id	Assigned Id	Utility	YES [1], NO [0]	YES[1], NO [0]												
D1	720	SoCal	1	0	LCK	ALM	88%	5	3	2	5	5	5	5	4	5
D2	718	SoCal	1	0	LCK	ALM	91%	5	5	5	1	4	5	5	5	1
D3p2	716A	SoCal	1	0	LCK	ALM	96%	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	1
B24	936&972	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	77%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B34	1005	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	75%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B36	1026	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	75%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B33	1000, 1024	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	75%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B18	924 & 960	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	77%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B19	927, 963	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	77%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B20	928, 964	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	77%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B21	930, 966	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	75%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B22	931 and 967	SDG&E	1	1	MAT	ALM	75%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B30	993 & 1017	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	75%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B25	996, 1020	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	75%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B31	997, 1021	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	75%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B32	999 and 1023	SDG&E	1	0	MAT	ALM	75%	5	5	5	5	4	0	3	5	3
B37p2	925 and 961	SDG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	80%	5	5	3	5	4	2	3	5	3
B38p2	937 and 973	SDG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	80%	5	5	3	5	4	2	3	5	3
C6	529	SCE	1	1	MAT	ALM	100%	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
C7, C2	553	SCE	1	1	MAT	ALM	98%	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5
C8, C3	555	SCE	1	1	MAT	ALM	81%	5	5	5	5	2	3	3	5	0
C4, C1	547 B&C, 558	SCE	1	0	MAT	ALM	98%	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5
C9p2	529D	SCE	1	0	LCK	ALM	80%	5	5	2	5	4	5	0	0	5
C10p2	547	SCE	1	0	LCK	ALM	96%	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	3
C11p2	548 and 559	SCE	1	1	LCK	ALM	89%	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	2	0
A5	349R1, 351R1	PG&E	1	1	LCK	ALM	76%	5	5	5	0	2	5	5	5	0
A3	311R2,382R2,,	PG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	81%	5	5	2	5	2	5	5	5	0
A28	315R2, 321R2,	PG&E	1	1	LCK	ALM	76%	5	5	5	2	4	5	5	3	0
A6	353R1,	PG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	83%	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	0
A11	353R2,	PG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	83%	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	0
A27	354R1, 385R1,	PG&E	1	1	LCK	ALM	77%	5	5	5	2	4	5	5	4	0
A22	354R2, 385R2,	PG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	76%	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	4	0
A17	372R1	PG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	86%	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5
A11	396R1	PG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	56%	3	3	3	3	4	2	0	0	0
A25	398R1	PG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	44%	3	3	3	3	3	2	0	0	0
A13	399R2	PG&E	1	0	LCK	ALM	54%	3	3	3	3	4	2	0	0	0
A30p2	322R2	PG&E	1	1	LCK	ALM	95%	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	0
A31p2	323R2, 424R1	PG&E	1	1	LCK	ALM	89%	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	2	0
A29p2	310R2, 324R2,	PG&E	1	1	LCK	ALM	71%	5	5	3	0	2	5	3	3	0

CPUC_Attachment_C_On-Site_Eval_MatrixSERAStudy.xls

	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
6	**Data Preparation & Validation**								
7	Documentation of Data Transfer Process	Quality of Data Transfer Process	Documentation of Data Compilation Process	Quality of Data Compilation Process	Documentation of Data Culling/ Formatting/ Quality Control Processes	Quality of Data Culling/ Formatting/ Quality Control Processes	Documentation of Data Analysis Process	Quality of Data Analysis Process	Presentation of Results
8	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
9	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**8**	**5**	**10**
10	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
11	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6	4.4	4.3	4.9	4.8	3.8
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2
13									
15	5	4	5	4	4	3	3	3	5
16	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
17	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
18	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3
19	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
20	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
21	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
22	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3
23	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3
24	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3
25	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
26	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
27	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
28	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
29	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
30	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
31	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
32	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2
33	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
34	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
35	5	5	0	0	5	5	5	5	5
36	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
37	2	2	5	5	2	2	5	5	5
38	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
39	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5
40	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5
41	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5
42	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	5	5
43	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5
44	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5
45	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	5	5
46	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5
47	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5
48	3	5	3	5	2	2	5	5	3
49	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	3
50	3	5	3	5	0	0	5	5	3
51	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
52	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5
53	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5
54									

CPUC_Attachment_C_On-Site_Eval_MatrixSERAStudy.xls

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
55	**Notes on Basis for Criteria Scoring:**																
56		Criteria	ID														
57	Selection of Sites for On-site Sampling	Documented Explanation of	A	High scores were assigned to those reports that indicated in detail the makeup of the sample and method of construction. Lower scores were attributed to reports where explanation of sampling methodology was unclear.													
58		Documented Justification of Sample Selection	B	High scores were assigned to those reports that clearly explained why sites were chosen to be included in the sample. Lower scores were attributed to reports where this explanation was unclear.													
59		Documented Justification of	C	High scores were assigned to those reports that clearly explained how the number of sites to be included in the sample was determined. Lower scores were attributed to reports where this explanation was unclear.													
60		Explanation Sample Population Screening/ Site Rejection	D	High scores were assigned to those reports that clearly explained how sites unfit for inclusion into the sample were determined. Lower scores were attributed to reports where this explanation was unclear.													
61	Data Collection Methodology	Documentation of Who Performed Data Collection	E	High scores were assigned to those reports that clearly explained who performed the on-site surveys and their affiliation. Lower scores were attributed to reports where this explanation was unclear.													
62		Documentation of Data Collection Procedures	F	High scores were assigned to those reports that clearly explained field practices used during the study. Lower scores were attributed to reports where this explanation was unclear. Scores of zero were given where no explanation of field practices was provided.													
63		Examples of Survey Instruments and	G	High scores were attributed to reports that provided samples of survey instruments/forms and provided explanation of their implementation. Lower scores were attributed if samples were provided but no explanation of their use was given. Scores of zero were given to reports where no examples or discussion of instruments was given.													
64		Quality of Survey Instruments and Forms, and Data Collected	H	This score represents the EE&T reviewers objective opinion of the quality of the survey instruments and their implementation.													
65		Documentation of Period of Field Data Collection	I	High scores were attributed to reports that indicated specific months and years of study data collection. Lower scores were attributed to reports where periods of data collection was vague. Scores of zero were attributed to reports where this information was omitted.													
66	Data Preparation & Validation	Documentation of Data Transfer	J	High scores were assigned to those reports that clearly explained how data was transferred from the field survey to the analysis phase during the study. Lower scores were attributed to reports where this explanation was unclear. Scores of													
67		Quality of Data Transfer Process	K	This score represents the EE&T reviewers objective opinion of the quality of data transfer processes and their implementation.													
68		Documentation of Data Compilation Process	L	High scores were assigned to those reports that clearly explained how data from the different field surveys were brought together during the study. Lower scores were attributed to reports where this explanation was unclear. Scores of zero were given where no explanation was provided.													
69		Quality of Data Compilation Process	M	This score represents the EE&T reviewers objective opinion of the quality of data compilation processes and their implementation.													
70		Documentation of Data Culling/ Formatting/	N	High scores were assigned to those reports that clearly explained how data from the field surveys was culled/formatted and what QC processes were used during the study. Lower scores were attributed to reports where this explanation was unclear. Scores of zero were given where no explanation was provided.													
71		Quality of Data Culling/ Formatting/ Quality Control Processes	O	This score represents the EE&T reviewers objective opinion of the quality of data culling/formatting/QC processes and their implementation.													
72		Documentation of Data Analysis	P	High scores were attributed to reports that clearly explained the methods of analysis employed during the study. Lower scores were given to reports where this explaination was unclear.													
73		Quality of Data	Q	This score represents the EE&T reviewers objective opinion of the quality of data analysis processes and their													
74		Presentation of Results	R	High scores were given to reports that contained a clear summary of the results of the study and a discussion of their significance. Lower scores were given to reports that lacked a discussion of the significance of results or lacked a													